



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, DC 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/068,507 07/15/98 EIJSINK V 1380-122PCT...

002292 HM12/0423
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

SLOBODYANSKY, E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1652

20

DATE MAILED:

04/23/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No.
09/068,507

Applicant(s)
Eijsink et al.

Examiner
Elizabeth Slobodyansky

Group Art Unit
1652



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Elizabeth Slobodyansky

(3) Mr. Craig McRobbie (attorney)

(2) Dr. Kristi Rupert (attorney)

(4) Dr. Vincent Eijsink (inventor)

Date of Interview Apr 20, 2001

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: all of record

Identification of prior art discussed:

Diep et al. (1994), Balaban et al.

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Possible ways to amend the claims to make the invention sufficiently described and enabled have been discussed.

Dr. Eijsink indicated that Diep et al. (1994) does not teach that the promoter of the plnABSD cluster is inducible.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

E. Slobodyansky
ELIZABETH SLOBODYANSKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 1652

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.